

## NORAD—Canada-U.S. Agreement

cleared up by the government, either during the course of this debate in order to give the country the confidence they are entitled to have in a government that has entered into an agreement in respect of a matter so important to the defence of this continent and nation.

The agreement is not an elaborate one; in fact, it is not an agreement at all. The material before us does not represent an agreement, it represents an agreement to agree on something. It is no more than that. Unless there are in the clauses not made available to us certain arrangements inconsistent with my last statement, then, as the Leader of the Opposition said, the simplicity of the agreement makes it one that could have been drawn up and signed nine months ago. Why all this delay? I suspect that one of the reasons is that this government took the view from the beginning, as taken by the Prime Minister this afternoon, that after all this was not the kind of question that really had to be submitted to parliament at all.

As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out today, in spite of the delay, the principle of the arrangement, of this agreement to agree, does make good sense. The point of the agreement, presumably, is to define how it will come into operation in an emergency. The agreement merely says that the plans and procedures to be followed by NORAD in wartime shall be formulated and approved in peacetime by the appropriate national authorities and shall be capable of rapid implementation in any emergency.

It is apparent that these plans and procedures have not yet been drawn up by NORAD or approved by the United States and Canadian governments, as they must be before they can be put into effect. One naturally asks the question: How do we pass from peace to wartime? Yet, last November the Minister of National Defence said that General Partridge in an emergency would be able to commit either Canadian or United States forces after consultation with the Canadian government and with the government of the United States. This would be done, he said, by telephone or other means. Later he amended the statement and said, as reported at page 1409 of *Hansard* of November 22, 1957:

—a series of plans are now being drawn up which will be approved by the governments of Canada and the United States. If the situation were such that United States air forces would be required for a particular operation over Canada, it may be assumed that that has been included in the preliminary plans and therefore it would merely be a question of advising the government of Canada that such a situation had arisen and such and such a plan should now be put into force.

That also represents a situation that requires on the part of the Minister of National Defence some clarification. "But these plans do not exist," would be the obvious comment to the Minister of National Defence. Without them perhaps NORAD is nothing more than a group of United States and Canadian officers in Colorado Springs with no authority to take necessary steps to defend this continent. If that is not the situation, I am sure that the Minister of National Defence when he speaks, will provide a satisfactory answer.

I say to the Prime Minister with regard to the document that he tabled today—a document formulated I think in 1951—that it does no more than what the Leader of the Opposition said. Its terms can now be integrated into NORAD or if that is not the situation one may well ask what is the reason for NORAD. Those are questions which I am sure the Prime Minister will agree require reply and further clarification. The agreement does not cover the point mentioned by the Minister of National Defence at all and this points up further deficiencies.

There are many questions, some of which have already been put by the Leader of the Opposition. Does NORAD mean, for instance, that Canada might have to defend the United States from attack from countries in other parts of the world other than the Soviet Union; for instance, from China or from South America? Does the agreement deal with potential situations of this sort which cannot be laughed out of court in the kind of world in which we are living? Is it true that Americans will concentrate on missiles to intercept invaders and that the only piloted aircraft will be manned by Canadians? I do not know whether that is the case, but surely that is the kind of question to which an answer should be furnished.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the number of personnel at NORAD headquarters who were Americans and the number who were Canadians. The Minister of National Defence, by his manner in the house this afternoon, indicated that he did not accept the particular figures quoted by the Leader of the Opposition. If this matter does not involve questions of security, perhaps he would give us some indication as to the relative strength of the Canadian forces in the United States under the command of General Partridge along with the numbers of Americans serving under him in this particular category.

Is it true that various service chiefs can pull units out of NORAD when they see fit to do so? Is the command of General Partridge absolute or does he find himself in